

Attorney Docket No. 4982/8  
PATENT

coupling the plurality of media components communicatively with the plurality of backup devices, and with a file processor, wherein each of the media components controls the archival functions of one or more backup devices;

generating an archival type request, by the at least one of client component to the file processor; and

directing, by the file through the plurality of media components, the backup devices to perform an archival function, in accordance with the archival type request.

16[7]. The method of claim 15[6], wherein at least two [of the plurality of] clients run different operating systems.

17[8]. The method of claim 16[7], wherein the archival type request[s] comprises a backup request[s] such that at least one copy of [a] the data is stored in a location other than an original location of the data.

#### REMARKS

In the most recent Office Action dated January 2, 2003, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-12, 14-15, and 17-18 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,414 to Anglin ("Anglin"). The examiner also further rejects claims 4-5, 10, 13, 16, and 19 under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Anglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,017 to Morris ("Morris").

As discussed in the interview, applicants cancel claims 1-6, 18, and 19 without admission and without prejudice. The applicants also amend claims 10-17 to correct an error in numbering due to the inadvertent omission of a claim 10 in the original application. The

Attorney Docket No. 4982/8  
PATENT

applicants also amend claims 16 and 17 to correct minor grammatical errors and harmonize these dependent claims with independent claim 15. The applicants also add claims 20-69 to more fully claim aspects of the present invention and overcome these rejections. No new matter has been added. For at least the reasons set forth below, the applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and request their allowance.

As discussed in the interview, Anglin discusses a problem wherein clients remote from backup servers and file servers request backups of data resulting in significant network traffic and network inefficiencies. (Col. 2, lines 1-35) Accordingly, Anglin discusses a system wherein a client requesting a backup is in the same physical location as any file servers and backup servers used to perform the backup. (Col. 2, Lines 22-57) Anglin thus provides a proxy client located in the same physical location as a file server and a backup server used to perform a backup for a remote client. (Col. 3, line 66 – Col. 2, line 7)

As discussed in the interview, Anglin essentially presents a standard backup system with the exception of a proxy client, functionally equivalent to a remote client, added at the same physical location as file servers and backup servers. In Anglin, the proxy client merely acts in place of the remote client to reduce network traffic, and is functionally equivalent to the remote client. (Col. 5, lines 4-19) Unlike the applicants' system, Anglin does not contain any teaching or suggestion of a management component or other component to direct or otherwise manage and oversee archival type requests for the system. Applicants' system, by contrast, contains a management component which enables modularity and scalability of the system. Anglin, lacking such a management component, is unable to provide these benefits.

Thus, Anglin does not disclose or suggest, as set forth in applicants' claim 7, a modular network storage system comprising: a file processor for directing functions associated

Attorney Docket No. 4982/8  
PATENT

with the archival of data over a network, including providing direction to a plurality of media components for directing the archival functions by controlling the archival functions of a plurality of backup devices; and a plurality of client components for generating archival type requests. For at least the above reasons, and as further discussed in the interview, claim 7 is patentable over the cited art.

Thus, Anglin does not disclose or suggest, as set forth in applicants' claim 15, a method for storing data over a network, comprising: providing a file processor, communicatively coupled to at least one client component and a plurality of media components, which directs through the plurality of media components, a plurality of backup devices to perform an archival function, in accordance with an archival type request generated by at least one of the client components. For at least the above reasons, and as further discussed in the interview, claim 15 is patentable over the cited art.

Thus, Anglin does not disclose or suggest, as set forth in applicants' claim 20, a method for performing an archival type request for a client computing device in a computer network, the method comprising: providing a management component, communicatively coupled to a client component and a media component, to direct the client component and the media component to perform an archival type request; providing a client component to coordinate backup and retrieval functions for the computing device; and providing a media component to control one or more backup devices directed to performing archival type requests. For at least the above reasons, and as further discussed in the interview, claim 20 is patentable over the cited art.

Thus, Anglin does not disclose or suggest, as set forth in applicants' claim 45, a system for performing an archival type request for a client computing device in a computer

Attorney Docket No. 4982/8  
PATENT

network, the system comprising: a management component programmed to direct a client component and a media component to perform the archival type request; wherein the client component is programmed to coordinate backup and retrieval functions for the computing device; and wherein the media component is programmed to control one or more backup devices directed to performing archival type requests. For at least the above reasons, and as further discussed in the interview, claim 45 is patentable over the cited art.

The dependent claims of the present application contain additional features that further substantially distinguish the invention of the present application over Anglin, Morris, and the other prior art of record. However, given the applicants' position on the patentability of the independent claims, it is not deemed necessary at this point to delineate such distinctions.

For at least all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections, and allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Dated: June 3, 2003

I hereby certify that the correspondence attached  
herewith is being transmitted by facsimile to the  
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313

Seth H. Ostrow  
Seth H. Ostrow  
Reg. No. 37,410

6-3-03  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

Seth H. Ostrow  
Seth H. Ostrow  
Reg. No. 37,410  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN  
FELDER & STEINER LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 895-2000